

Searching

CS 240

Alex Vondrak

ajvondrak@csupomona.edu

Winter 2012

Searching

Definition (The Searching Problem)

Given: An array, $E[]$ haystack and an item, E needle

Return: **true** if needle can be found at any point in haystack;
otherwise, **false**

I.e., “can we find this element in this sequence?”

Multiple Choice Question

Given the haystack

`{3, 1, 4, 1, 5, 9, 2}`

is the needle 1 in the haystack?

- (A) Yes
- (B) No

Multiple Choice Question

What do you suppose our algorithm is for finding 1 in the following array?

{3, 1, 4, 1, 5, 9, 2}

- (A) Look through each element, stop when we see a 1
- (B) Look through each element, stop when we see something that isn't a 1
- (C) Look through every element, but don't stop; note whether we saw 1 anywhere
- (D) Look at index [1] or [3]

Multiple Choice Question

What do you suppose our algorithm is for finding 1 in the following array?

{8, 6, 7, 5, 3, 0, 9}

- (A) Look through each element, stop when we see a 1
- (B) Look through each element, stop when we see something that isn't a 1
- (C) Look through every element, but don't stop; note whether we saw 1 anywhere
- (D) Look at index [1] or [3]

Multiple Choice Question

```
public boolean search(E needle, E[] haystack) {  
    ⋮  
}
```

How would we code this algorithm?

- (A) Use a **for**-loop
- (B) Use recursion
- (C) Either of the above
- (D) None of the above

Multiple Choice Question

```
public boolean search(E needle, E[] haystack) {  
    for (E item : haystack) {  
        :  
    }  
}
```

What should we do in the body of the **for**-loop?

- (A) Check if `item` is the same thing as the `needle`
- (B) Check if `item` is **not** the same as `needle`
- (C) Both of the above
- (D) None of the above

Multiple Choice Question

```
public boolean search(E needle, E[] haystack) {
    for (E item : haystack) {
        if (item.equals(needle)) {
            ...
        }
    }
}
```

Why do we use `equals` instead of `==`?

- (A) Because `==` doesn't do a "deep" comparison
- (B) Because `==` only compares addresses
- (C) Because `item` and `needle` are objects, not primitive types
- (D) All of the above

Multiple Choice Question

```
public boolean search(E needle, E[] haystack) {  
    for (E item : haystack) {  
        if (item.equals(needle)) {  
            ...  
        }  
    }  
}
```

If we've found the needle, what should we do?

- (A) Set a **boolean** flag to **true**
- (B) Return **true**
- (C) Increment a counter
- (D) Advance to the next element

Multiple Choice Question

```
public boolean search(E needle, E[] haystack) {  
    for (E item : haystack) { (A)  
        if (item.equals(needle)) { (B)  
            return true; (C)  
        }  
        else {  
            return false; (D)  
        }  
    }  
}
```

Where is the bug in the above code?

Multiple Choice Question

```
public boolean search(E needle, E[] haystack) {  
    for (E item : haystack) {  
        if (item.equals(needle)) {  
            return true;  
        }  
    }  
    return false;  
}
```

What is the running time complexity of the above method?

- (A) $O(1)$
- (B) $O(\log n)$
- (C) $O(n)$
- (D) $O(n^2)$

Multiple Choice Question

Let's make the search method recursive.

```
public boolean search(E needle, E[] haystack) {  
    if (/* Base Case */) {  
        ...  
    }  
    /* Recursive Case */  
}
```

What do you suppose the base case should be?

- (A) If haystack is empty
- (B) If needle is equal to haystack[0]
- (C) If needle is **null**
- (D) None of the above

Multiple Choice Question

Let's make the search method recursive.

```
public boolean search(E needle, E[] haystack, int i) {  
    if (/* Base Case */) {  
        ...  
    }  
    /* Recursive Case */  
}
```

What do you suppose the base case should be *now*?

- (A) If $i == 0$
- (B) If needle is equal to haystack[0]
- (C) If needle is equal to haystack[i]
- (D) If $i \geq \text{haystack.length}$

Multiple Choice Question

Let's make the search method recursive.

```
public boolean search(E needle, E[] haystack, int i) {
    if (i >= haystack.length) {
        return false;
    }
    /* Recursive Case */
}
```

What is the recursive case?

- (A) When `i < haystack.length`
- (B) When `needle` is equal to `haystack[i]`
- (C) Both of the above

Multiple Choice Question

Let's make the search method recursive.

```
public boolean search(E needle, E[] haystack, int i) {
    if (i >= haystack.length) {
        return false;
    }
    if (needle.equals(haystack[i])) {
        return true;
    }
    /* Recursive Case */
}
```

What is the recursive case?

- (A) When `i < haystack.length`
- (B) When `needle` is not equal to `haystack[i]`
- (C) Both of the above

Multiple Choice Question

Let's make the search method recursive.

```
public boolean search(E needle, E[] haystack, int i) {
    if (i >= haystack.length) {
        return false;
    }
    if (needle.equals(haystack[i])) {
        return true;
    }
    return this.search(needle, haystack, i + 1);
}
```

What is the running time complexity of the above method?

- (A) $O(1)$
- (B) $O(\log n)$
- (C) $O(n)$
- (D) $O(n^2)$

Multiple Choice Question

Let's make the search method recursive.

```
public boolean search(E needle, E[] haystack, int i) {  
    if (i >= haystack.length) {  
        return false;  
    }  
    if (needle.equals(haystack[i])) {  
        return true;  
    }  
    return this.search(needle, haystack, i + 1);  
}
```

Let $T(n)$ be the **exact** running time of the above method (though, assume constant-time operations only cost 1). How can we express it?

- (A) $T(0) = 1$
- (B) $T(n) = 1 + T(n - 1)$
- (C) Both of the above
- (D) None of the above

Multiple Choice Question

Can we improve upon the time complexity of the search problem?

- (A) Yes
- (B) No
- (C) Maybe

Binary Search

Definition

Suppose you want to search through a **sorted** array,

$$S = \{S_1, S_2, S_3, \dots, S_n\}$$

for a particular element, x .

In general, you're always searching between two indices: L and R .

Initially, it would be between $L = 1$ and $R = n$.

- Let $M = \lfloor (L + R)/2 \rfloor$
- If $L > R$, then x is not in S (Base Case)
- If $S_M = x$, then x is in S (Base Case)
- If $S_M > x$, then search between L and $M - 1$ (Recursive Case)
- If $S_M < x$, then search between $M + 1$ and R (Recursive Case)

Multiple Choice Question

After having coded a binary search recursively, how can we express its running time, $T(n)$?

- (A) $T(0) = 1, T(n) = 1 + T(n - 1)$
- (B) $T(1) = 1, T(n) = 1 + T(n - 1)$
- (C) $T(0) = 1, T(n) = 1 + T(n/2)$
- (D) $T(1) = 1, T(n) = 1 + T(n/2)$

Multiple Choice Question

Loosely speaking (to save the headache), we have

$$T(1) = 1$$

$$T(n) = 1 + T(n/2)$$

Proof Sketch ($T(n) = 1 + \log_2 n$).

By induction on n .

Base:

Inductive:



What is the base case?

- (A) $n = 0$
- (B) $n = 1$
- (C) $T(n) = 1$
- (D) $1 + \log_2(0)$

Multiple Choice Question

Loosely speaking (to save the headache), we have

$$T(1) = 1$$

$$T(n) = 1 + T(n/2)$$

Proof Sketch ($T(n) = 1 + \log_2 n$).

By induction on n .

Base: When $n = 1$, $1 + \log_2(1) = 1 + 0 = 1 = T(n)$

Inductive: As our I.H., assume...



What is the Inductive Hypothesis?

- (A) $T(1) = 1$
- (B) $T(k) = 1 + \log_2(k)$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$
- (C) $T(r) = 1 + \log_2(r)$ for any $r \leq k \in \mathbb{N}$
- (D) $T(k+1) = 1 + \log_2(k)$

Multiple Choice Question

Loosely speaking (to save the headache), we have

$$T(1) = 1$$

$$T(n) = 1 + T(n/2)$$

Proof Sketch ($T(n) = 1 + \log_2 n$).

By induction on n .

Base: When $n = 1$, $1 + \log_2(1) = 1 + 0 = 1 = T(1)$.

Inductive: As our I.H., assume $T(r) = 1 + \log_2(r)$ for any $r \leq k \in \mathbb{N}$.



What do we want to be true now?

- (A) $T(1) = 1$
- (B) $T(k) = 1 + \log_2(k)$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$
- (C) $T(r) = 1 + \log_2(r)$ for any $r \leq k \in \mathbb{N}$
- (D) $T(k+1) = 1 + \log_2(k)$

Loose Proof That Binary Search Is $O(\log_2(n))$

$$T(1) = 1$$

$$T(n) = 1 + T(n/2)$$

Proof Sketch ($T(n) = 1 + \log_2 n$).

Base: When $n = 1$, $1 + \log_2(1) = 1 + 0 = 1 = T(n)$.

Inductive: As our I.H., assume $T(r) = 1 + \log_2(r)$ for any $r \leq k \in \mathbb{N}$.

$$\begin{aligned} T(k+1) &= 1 + T((k+1)/2) \\ &= 1 + 1 + \log_2((k+1)/2) && \text{(by I.H.)} \\ &= 1 + 1 + \log_2(k+1) - \log_2(2) \\ &= 1 + 1 + \log_2(k+1) - 1 \\ &= 1 + \log_2(k+1) \end{aligned}$$



Multiple Choice Question

What's the issue with the Binary Search algorithm?

- (A) It will work when the array is unsorted, but slower
- (B) It won't work when the array is unsorted
- (C) We have to sort the array before a search
- (D) Nothing; it's much faster than a linear search

Multiple Choice Question

Can we think of an algorithm **better** than $O(\log_2(n))$?

- (A) Yes
- (B) No
- (C) Probably